

### REMARKS

Filed concurrently herewith is a request for a one-month of extension of time which extends the shortened statutory period for response to October 3, 2003.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Examiner's action dated June 3, 2003, has been received and its contents carefully noted. In view thereof, claims 12 and 14 have been amended and a new Abstract has been presented in order to place the present application in condition for allowance. As previously, claims 5 and 8-14 are presently pending in the instant application with claims 8-11 being withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner.

Referring now to the Official Action, and particularly page 2 thereof, the Examiner has objected to the Abstract of the disclosure in that the Abstract is not directed to the claimed inventions. In this regard, as can be seen from the foregoing amendments, a substitute Abstract of the disclosure has been presented which is indicative of Applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that with the replacement of the Abstract, the present application is now in proper formal condition for allowance.

With reference to paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claims 12 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In this regard, the Examiner notes that the phrase "a dopant concentration of a source offset region is set lower than a dopant concentration of a drain offset region such that the following inequality is not easily satisfied:  $VW - (a \text{ forward biased breakdown voltage of silicon}) > VS$ " is unclear. As can be seen from the foregoing amendments, each of claims 12 and 14 have been amended in order to better define that which Applicant regards as the invention. Particularly, each of these claims has been amended to recite a high voltage MOS transistor wherein the inequality is not satisfied during operation of the high voltage MOS transistor. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that each of independent claims 12 and 14

now particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention and are in proper formal condition for allowance.


With reference to paragraph 3 of the Office Action, Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claims 5 and 13 are allowable over the prior art of record and indication of such is again earnestly solicited.

As to paragraph 4 of the Office Action, it is noted that claims 12 and 14 have been indicated as being allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action. Accordingly, with the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants' claimed invention as set forth in each of independent claims 12 and 14, now particularly points out and distinctly claims that which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims likewise be indicated as being allowable over the prior art of record.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the objections and rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 5, 12, 13 and 14 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner believe a conference would be of benefit in expediting the prosecution in the instant application, it is hereby invited to telephone counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Donald R. Studebaker  
Reg. No. 32,815

NIXON PEABODY LLP  
401 Ninth Street, N.W.  
Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 585-8000  
(202) 585-8080 (FAX)